UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/637,186	08/08/2003	Jim Holmes	Pion.2.US	Pion.2.US 3944	
Janah & Associ	7590 03/22/2007 ates. P.C.		EXAM	IINER	
Suite 106	·		PHASGE, ARUN S		
650 Delancey S San Francisco,			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
· ·			1753		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/22/2007	PAI	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/637,186	HOLMES ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Arun S. Phasge	1753			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ss		
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS INSTRUCTION OF THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commit D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status				•		
1)⊠ 2a)□ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Ja This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		erits is		
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ <b>Applicati</b> 9)□	Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-58 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access and are subjected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access and access access access access access and access acces	rn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting The oath or declaration is objected to by the Extended to be the Extended to the correction of the cor			• •		
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some color None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment  1) Notice  2) Notice	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔯 Inforn	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

# Page 2

### DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

Claims 21-58 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 1/31/07.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyberg, U.S. 5,788,826 in view of Tessier, U.S. Patent 5,762,774.

The Nyberg patent discloses an apparatus and method to treat an influent solution comprising an electrochemical cell having housing and water-splitting membrane between the first and second electrode, an inlet and outlet and an ion sensor to measure and control the ion concentration (see claims 1-57 and col. 20, lines 24-34).

The patent does not disclose that the voltage is controlled based upon the amount of the ions or the use of a variable voltage supply as claimed. The Tessier patent is cited to show that such control of the voltage based upon the ionic conductivity of the fluid is used in the art to purify liquids (see Abstract and claims 1-19).

Consequently, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Nyberg with the teachings of the Tessier patent, because the Tessier patent teaches the use of a control of the voltage, which would have to be a variable voltage supply, to obtain a purified solution.

Art Unit: 1753

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is (571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Arun S. Phasge Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753